

A1  
5. (amended) The method of claim 1 wherein the maximum allowed vehicle deceleration is capable of varying continuously. ~~1B~~

A2  
5  
7. (amended) The method of claim 1 wherein the maximum allowed vehicle deceleration is an exponential function of the vehicle speed.

Sub  
A3 B4  
11. (amended) The system of claim 9 wherein, to set the maximum allowed vehicle deceleration, the controller is capable of decreasing the maximum allowed vehicle deceleration as the vehicle speed increases.

12. (amended) The system of claim 9 wherein, to set the maximum allowed vehicle deceleration, the controller is capable of increasing the maximum allowed vehicle deceleration as the vehicle speed decreases.

13. (amended) The system of claim 9 wherein the maximum allowed vehicle deceleration is capable of varying continuously. ~~1B~~

11  
14  
15. (amended) The system of claim 7 wherein the maximum allowed vehicle deceleration is an exponential function of the vehicle speed.

### Remarks

The present application is a continuation of co-pending application U.S.S.N. 09/470,365 filed December 22, 1999 ("the parent application"). Claims 1-16 as filed in this application are the same claims 1-16 originally filed in the parent application. By this Preliminary Amendment, the Applicants have canceled claims 2 and 10 without prejudice. As a result, claims 1, 3-9 and 11-16 are now pending.

In the Office Action mailed March 21, 2001 in the parent application, the Examiner rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S.P.N. 5,835,878 to Saito et al. ("the Saito '878 patent). The Examiner also rejected claims 1 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S.P.N. 6,178,370 to Zierolf ("the Zierolf '370